

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexasdra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.nepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,318	09/29/2005	Alan Bradburn	12400-024	6734
757 BRINKS HOE	7590 02/12/200 ER GILSON & LIONE	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 10395			FREEDMAN, LAURA BETH	
CHICAGO, II	. 60610		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
10/518,318	BRADBURN, ALAN			
Examiner	Art Unit			
LAURA FREEDMAN	3616			

Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	I			
	LAURA FREEDMAN	3616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence ac	idress			
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D./ Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR.1: after SIX (5) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the proof for each particular discere, the most of the abundance of the communication of the communicatio	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the	e merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw						
5)⊠ Claim(s) 11 is/are allowed.	William Consideration.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
	·					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 14 December 2004 is/a		-	niner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P	IO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).				
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No				
3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the prior			Stage			
application from the International Bureau	•		- 0			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F					

6) Other: Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/14/04; 6/8/05; 8/28/06.

Art Unit: 3611

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention,

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention. In regards to claim 1, it is unclear how the "central

polygonal region carrying a protruding flap" can include "upper and lower flaps and at

least two side flaps". Examiner recommends rephrasing to specify a central polygonal region carrying "at least one protruding flap", "a plurality of flaps", or something similar.

Also, in regards to claim 1, the last 3 lines are unclear and should be rewritten.

Examiner interpreted this portion of claim 1 as set forth in the prior art rejection below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- Claims 1-4, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyake et al. (JP05-077342). Miyake et al. disclose:
- Air-bag (can be seen in drawings) formed from a single element of a laminar material

Art Unit: 3611

Central polygonal region (for example, including region and shape shown in figure 7)
having at least four generally linear side edges, and having a shape and
configuration equivalent to that of the air-bag when inflated

- Protruding flaps (for example, including #1-4) including upper and lower flaps and at least two side flaps
- At least one infill element (for example, including portions of flaps that overlap and are adjacent each other, near corners of central polygonal region) defined between the side flaps and the upper and lower flaps
- The flaps being inwardly folded to overlie the central polygonal region and at least
 partially to overlie each other, the infill elements lying between respective flaps, and
 the flaps being secured to form the air-bag (see drawings)
- Aperture (for example, including #6) able to receive a gas generator (paragraph 0014)
- Reinforcement is provided around the aperture (if needed; paragraph 0014)
- At least one of the infill elements is of triangular form (for example, including triangular portions of flaps that overlap and are adjacent each other, near corners of central polygonal region)
- The upper and lower flaps and the side flaps are secured by means of adhesive (paragraph 0015)

Art Unit: 3611

 The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be neadtived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyake et al. (JP05-077342) as applied to claims 1-4, 8, and 9 above, and further in view of Lang et al. (5,536,043). Miyake et al. do not disclose the specific location of the airbag in the car (paragraph 0001). Lang et al. teach a knee protection air-bag (for example, including components of knee bolster #20). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the air-bag of Miyake et al. to be used in the form of a knee protection air-bag as taught by Lang et al., so as to provide lower torso restraint during a crash situation (Lang et al.: Summary of the Invention). Further, using the known technique on similar device in the same field is an obvious and predictable variation.

Allowable Subject Matter

- Claim 11 is allowed.
- 8. Claims 5-7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art does not disclose two flaps having a combined area greater than

Art Unit: 3611

the area of the central polygonal region, in combination with other features of the claims.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Oka et al., Lalonde, Niederman et al., Taguchi et al., Robertson et al., and Thomas disclose an air-bag having a central polygonal region and protruding

flaps that are inwardly folded to overlie the central polygonal region.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAURA FREEDMAN whose telephone number is 571-272-2442. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lesley Morris can be reached on 571-272-6651. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LF /Anne Marie M Boehler/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3611